



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/738,319 | 12/18/2000 | Salah Ait-Mokhtar | D/A0466 | 2262 |

7590 05/15/2003

Oliff & Berridge PLC
P O Box 19928
Alexandria, CA 22320

EXAMINER

HARPER, V PAUL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 05/15/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. 09/738,319 | Applicant(s) AIT-MOKHTAR ET AL. |
| | Examiner V. Paul Harper | Art Unit 2654 |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.

 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

 - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.

 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-20 is/are pending in the application.

 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.

 6) Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-20 is/are rejected.

 7) Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.

 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

 10) The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

 If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

 a) All b) Some * c) None of:

 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.

 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

 * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

 a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

| | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The Examiner has considered the references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement dated 10/15/02. A copy of the Information Disclosure Statement is attached to this office action.

Claim Objections

2. Claim10 is objected to because of the following informalities: on line 1, the term "variable" should be replaced with –variables--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-8, 10-18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Liddy et al. (US Patent 6,202,064), hereinafter referred to as Liddy.

Regarding claims 1 and 15, Liddy discloses a multilingual document retrieval method. The steps taught by Liddy include the following: entering a query or document for processing (Figs. 1 and 2 70 110, col. 2, Ins. 42-65), which corresponds to "(a)

receiving the input strings”; subjecting each document to a sequence of processing steps where one of the initial steps includes part of speech tagging (col. 2, Ins. 55-60, col. 7, Ins. 21-46), which corresponds to “(b) linguistically analyzing the input strings to generate a first representation of each of the input strings; each of the first representations including linguistic information;” generating both conceptual and term-based alternative representations of the documents and queries with relevant information extracted from the documents and indexed (col. 6, Ins. 15-20, Figs. 1 and 2, col. 6, ln. 63 through col. 7, ln. 5), which corresponds to “(c) skeletising each of the first representations to generate a corresponding second representation for each of the input strings; said skeletising step replacing the linguistic information with abstract variables in each of the second representations”; and storing the processed documents in a database (col. 6, Ins. 25-32, Fig. 1 **60**), which corresponds to “(d) storing the second representation as normalized representations of the input strings.”

Regarding claim 2, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Liddy teaches that multiple processing steps are performed including part of speech tagging and proper noun categorization (Fig. 2, col. 7, Ins. 21-46), which corresponds to “said step of linguistically analyzing comprises performing a plurality of operating functions.”

Regarding claim 3, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 2). In addition, Liddy teaches that the processing steps include part of speech tagging, finding root forms, and concept tagging (col. 9, Ins. 7-18, col. 10, Ins. 26-40,

col. 11, Ins. 6-16, and Ins. 34-53), which corresponds to “performing one of morphological analysis, syntactic analysis, and semantic analysis.”

Regarding claim 4, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 3); in addition, Liddy teaches the finding of the root forms of the words (col. 11, Ins. 6-8), which corresponds to “normalizing words according to their base forms.”

Regarding claim 5, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 3); in addition, Liddy teaches the use of a part of speech tagger that identifies words as nouns, verbs, etc. (col. 9, Ins. 11-18), which corresponds to “extracting a syntactic category for individual words.”

Regarding claim 6, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 3); in addition, teaches the use of a preprocessor that performs discourse level tagging (col. 8, Ins. 41-53) and processing modules that tag words and phrases (col. 10, Ins. 53-63) in addition to part of speech tagging (col. 9, Ins. 11-18), which corresponds to “extracting syntactic information representing string structure.”

Regarding claim 7, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 3). In addition, Liddy teaches further processing to disambiguate concept group assignments using a tree structure to represent portions of the text and indicate relations between words (col. 16, In. 42 through col. 18, In. 30, in particular col. 17, Ins. 22-39, Fig. 7), which corresponds to “extracting dependency relations between sub-structures of a string.”

Regarding claim 8, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 3); in addition, Liddy teaches the use of concept groups (col. 9, In. 7 through col.

12, ln. 10) and considers polysemous words having multiple concept-category tags linking individual words to a single multilingual concept group (col. 11, Ins. 35-55), which corresponds to “providing semantic links for individual words.”

Regarding claim 10, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1); in addition, Liddy teaches the use of conceptual and term-based representations including the use of part of speech tagging (col. 6, Ins. 15-20, col. 9, Ins. 7-19), which corresponds to “the abstract variable[s] are tags indicating the replaced linguistic information.”

Regarding claim 11, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1); in addition, Liddy teaches that the process documents are stored in a database (col. 6, Ins. 25-32, Ins. 62-67, Fig. 1 60), which corresponds to “the normalized representations are stored in a database.”

Regarding claim 12, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 11). In addition, Liddy teaches the following steps: accepting a query (Fig. 1 70, col. 2, Ins. 42-54), which corresponds to “receiving a query”; processing the query (col. 7, Ins. 20-46, and also see rejection of claim 1, above), which corresponds to “generating a normalized representation of said query by performing steps (b) and (c)”; matching the processed query to a processed document (Fig. 1 55, col. 7, Ins. 20-46, col. 18, §7.0, “Matching Documents to Queries”), which corresponds to “matching the normalized representation of said query to the normalized representations stored in the database”; and outputting the results of the query match (Fig. 1 70, col. 20, §8.2

“Graphical User Interface (GUI)”), which corresponds to “retrieving from said database strings identified by said matching step.”

Regarding claim 13, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 1). In addition, Liddy teaches that the processing of queries or documents into language independent representations where the languages supported include English, French, German, etc. (col. 2, ln. 42 through col. 3, ln. 33), which corresponds to “said steps (a) - (d) are performed to generate a translation memory comprising a plurality of normalized representations of strings in a first language and a second language.”

Regarding claim 14, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 13). In addition, Liddy teaches the following steps: receiving a query and determining the language of the query (Fig. 2, 110 120), which corresponds to “receiving an input string in the first language”; matching the conceptual representation of the string to representations in the database documents that match and retrieving text that matches (col. 2, ln. 65 through col. 3, ln. 33, col. 4, Ins. 6-10), which corresponds to “retrieving a similar string in said first language from said plurality of normalized representations”; the system can also perform a gloss transliteration (col. 3, Ins. 7-14) or a machine translation (col. 22, Ins. 30-38), which corresponds to “outputting said translation information based on a string in said second language which corresponds to said retrieved string in said first language.”

Regarding claim 16, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 15); in addition, the claim limitations correspond to some of those given in claim 12 and are rejected for the same reasons given above.

Regarding claim 17, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 16); in addition, the claim limitations correspond to some of those given in claim 12 and are rejected for the same reasons given above.

Regarding claim 18, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 16). In addition, Liddy teaches that the conceptualized (translated) documents are stored in a database (col. 2, Ins. 43-65, Fig. 1 **60**) and that for documents that contain industry-specific terminology, associated multilingual objects may be stored (col. 22, Ins. 49-54), which corresponds to “a translation memory for storing translations of the input strings.”

Regarding claim 20, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 2). In addition, Liddy teaches that a sequence of processing modules are executed (to generate the language independent representation) (col. 7, ln. 21 through col. 8, ln. 40, Fig. 2) where these modules are inherently stored in the system, which corresponds to “storing further comprises storing the operating functions performed on the normalized representations.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liddy in view of Collins ("Discriminative Reranking for Natural Language Parsing," *Proc. 17th International Conf. on Machine Learning*, July 2000).

Regarding claim 19, Liddy teaches everything claimed, as applied above (see claim 2), but Liddy does not specifically teach "performing machine learning for selecting particular operating functions out of said plurality of operating functions and for determining the processing order." However, the examiner contends that this concept was well known in the art, as taught by Collins.

In the same field of endeavor, Collins teaches the machine learning technique of discriminative reranking for natural language parsing where reranking techniques can be applied to problems in natural language processing to improve the resulting representations (§1 "Introduction").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Liddy by specifically providing reranking techniques, as taught by Collins, for the purpose of improving the resulting representation.

Citation of Pertinent Art

5. The following prior art made of record but not relied upon is considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure:

a. Hargrave, III et al. (US Patent 6,131,083) discloses a machine translation system using an interlingua-based approach.

- b. Huffman (US Patent 5,796,926) discloses a method for learning extraction patterns for an information extraction system.
- c. Julliard (US Patent 6,202,064) discloses a linguistic search system that performs multiple steps on queries and documents to generate regular expressions.
- d. Tucker, Jr. ("A Perspective on Machine Translation: Theory and Practice," *Communications of the ACM*, April 1984) describes second-generation (interlinqua-based) language translation systems.

Conclusion

Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:

Crystal Park II
2121 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA.
Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. V. Paul Harper whose telephone number is (703) 305-4197. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha D. Banks-Harold, can be reached on (703) 305-4379. The fax phone number for the Technology Center 2600 is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Marsha D. Banks-Harold
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

VPH/vph
May 8, 2003